

said second node synchronizing with the timed intervals to selectively enter and remain in a low power state either one of between consecutive transmissions at periodic intervals and between nonconsecutive transmissions at periodic intervals.

48. (New) The communication network of claim 47 wherein at least one of the first node and the second node comprising a roaming terminal.

49. (New) The communication network of claim 48 wherein the second node directs further operation of its transceiver to receive messages during a time period that follows one of the wireless transmissions from the first node.

50. (New) The communication network of claim 49 wherein the time period immediately follows the one of the wireless transmissions from the first node.

51. (New) The communication network of claim 49 wherein the time period follows the one of the wireless transmissions from the first node during an awake time window.

52. (New) The communication network of claim 51 wherein the awake time window occurs an offset time following the one of the wireless transmissions from the first node.

Remarks

Claims 38-40 are pending. New claims 41-52 are presented for examination. In the Office Action dated March 2, 2000, claims 38-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Natarajan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,241,542), and the title of the invention was objected to as not being descriptive. As set forth below, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for at least the reason that numerous

elements required by the claims are neither taught nor suggested by the Natarajan reference.

The Title

The title has been amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion to more clearly reflect the claimed subject matter. Approval of the new title is respectfully requested.

The Specification

The Cross-Reference section of the application has been amended as indicated above to adjust the priority claim in view of the pending claims.

The Claims

New claims 41-52 are presented for examination. These claims are directed to similar subject matter as the pending claims, and are asserted to be allowable for reasons similar to those discussed below with respect to pending claims 38-40.

The Section 103 Rejections

Claims 38-40 were rejected under Section 103 as being unpatentable over Natarajan. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for the reason that numerous elements required by the claims are neither taught nor suggested by the Natarajan reference. For example, independent claim 38 recites "each of said roaming data collection terminals selectively deactivate its wireless transceiver for a consecutive plurality of the defined intervals, and then activates its wireless transceiver to allow receiving the information packets."

In contrast, among other deficiencies, Natarajan does not teach or suggest each of the roaming data collection terminals selectively deactivating its wireless transceiver for pluralities of the defined intervals (independent claim 38). Effectively, the mobile units 10-16 taught by Natarajan must wake up at least twice during each time interval between consecutive AH headers to determine if there is data to be sent by a base station.

More particularly, as clearly described in Natarajan (col. 4, line 20 - col. 5, line 8), each of the mobile users must be ON or awake *during each header AH* (see col. 4, lines 41-45) to determine if a base station has packets for that mobile user. If the base station has packets for a mobile user, that mobile user may turn its receiver OFF for a time duration for a number of “slots allocated to all receiving units that precede it” (col. 5, lines 1-2), and then wake up to receive a packet during the interval A. The slots are portions of interval A and are *not* themselves defined intervals during which pending information packets are transmitted (see claim 38) or indicated (see claim 40). The mobile units 10-16 of Natarajan *all* wake up for the subsequent header BH (col. 5, lines 7-8). In this manner, the mobile units taught by Natarajan must wake up at least twice during each time interval between consecutive AH headers to determine if there is data to be sent by a base station, and thus are unlikely to provide the opportunity for power savings such as that associated with the claimed subject matter.

Applicants respectfully submit, therefore, that independent claim 38 is allowable over Natarajan and requests withdrawal of this rejection.

Further, Natarajan does not teach nor suggest sending pending message indications at selected time intervals wherein the roaming terminals are permitted to selectively

deactivate their transceivers through multiple of such time intervals (claim 40). Though Natarajan shows indicating packets available during *each* of the AH headers, the mobile users must be awake during each of the AH headers, and thus are not OFF or asleep during multiple of such intervals.

More succinctly, Natarajan does not teach transmitting a pending message list during each of the time slots during interval A. If the Examiner is aware of any such teaching in the prior art, Applicants respectfully request that it be cited with greater particularity than set forth in the Office Action.

Claims 39-40 are thus believed to be in a condition for allowance for at least this reason and the reasons set forth above in reference to the independent claim 38 from which they depend.

In addition, new claims 41-52 relate to several features similar to those found in claims 38-40, and, thus, are also believed to be allowable for at least the reasons set forth above.

It is therefore submitted that the claims now present are neither shown nor made obvious in view of the Natarajan reference. Applicants respectfully submit that in view of at least the arguments present herein, all claims now present are allowable. Reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicants submit that the foregoing amendments and remarks are fully responsive to the various rejections. Applicants respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn and that the claims be allowed.

If any impediment to the allowance of the claims remains after entry of this amendment, and such impediment could be alleviated during a telephone interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: August 2, 2000

H. Shannon Tyson, Jr.
By: H. Shannon Tyson, Jr. *with permission*
Reg. No.: 42,193 *prp*

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS

Akin, Gump, Strauss, Hauer & Feld, L.L.P.
816 Congress Avenue, Suite 1900
Austin, Texas 78701
Tel: (512) 499-6200
Fax: (512) 499-6290